

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested. Claims 1-11 are pending, Claims 1, 8, 9 and 11 having been amended by the present amendment. Support for the amendments is found in the present specification, for example at page 12, first full paragraph. Therefore, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 5-6 and 8-9 were rejected as being anticipated by Blewett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,131,141, hereinafter Blewett); Claim 2 was rejected as being unpatentable over Blewett in view of Ogle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,736, hereinafter Ogle); Claim 4 was rejected as being unpatentable over Blewett in view of Beck (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,273); Claim 7 was rejected as being unpatentable over Blewett in view of Winkler (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0070100); and Claim 10 was rejected as being unpatentable over Blewett in view of Koyanagi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0013067, hereinafter Koyanagi).

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to an information processing apparatus that includes means for managing settings for connectable networks as profiles on a network by network basis. The apparatus includes means for detecting a first connection to a detected network, the first connection being a state in which the detecting means detects a wireless service when the information processing apparatus is brought into a coverage range of the wireless service. Nonlimiting support for this amendment is found in the present specification at page 12, lines 6-10, and therefore no new matter is added. The apparatus also includes means for determining whether the managing means manages a managed profile corresponding to the detected network when the detecting means has detected the first connection to the detected network. Claim 1 also includes means for automatically establishing a second connection to the detected network based on the managed profile if the determination means determines

that the managing means manages the managed profile corresponding to the detected network. The second connection is a state in which the information processing apparatus uses the wireless service of the detected network after authorized via an authorization process. Nonlimiting support for the second connection language is found in the present specification, at page 12, lines 10-13, and therefore no new matter is added.

The information processing apparatus of amended Claim 1 operates in a wireless communication network. This is clear because the first connection language requires the detecting means to detect a wireless service when the information processing apparatus is brought into a coverage range of the wireless service. Also, the second connection actually uses the wireless service of the detected network after authorization via an authorization process. As such, the second connection can be automatically established to the detected network, provided the first connection is detected by the detecting means in advance. In a nonlimiting example, a terminal 10 may exchange data with a gateway during a first phase of communication, and then in a second phase of communication, the terminal may freely exchange data at will over the network subsequent to an authentication process (specification, page 11, last line to page 12, line 5).

The Office Action asserts that Blewett discloses all the elements of Claim 1. Applicants traverse this assertion. The Office Action associates a security gateway as being a “first connection” to a trusted network. However, this is not the context in which the meaning of the “first connection” applies to Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to include language describing the first connection as defining a state in which the detecting means detects a wireless service when the information processing apparatus is brought into a coverage range of the wireless service. Blewett does not discuss such a first connection in this context. Instead, the Office Action relies on a preexisting connection to a trusted network (e.g., worknet). Nothing in Blewett would teach or suggest an apparatus that detects

the first connection to a detected network, where the detection of a wireless service occurs when the information processing apparatus is brought into a coverage range of the wireless service.

The Office Action also relies on Blewett's disclosure of transmission of packets traveling from a protected resource network to a worknet where a rule set assures that only packets of a protected resource network that are accepted from a tunnel and that only packets bound for a worknet are accepted from the tunnel. Assuming, *arguendo*, this is correct, this disclosure does not correspond with the claimed second connection, that defines a state in which the information processing apparatus uses the detected service the detected network after authorized via an authorization process.

Finally, in this context, Claim 1 further requires automatically establishing the second connection to the detected network based on the managed profile if the determination means determines that the managing means manages the managed profile corresponding to the detected network. The Office Action explains that "automatic" is determined in a very broad context, by referring to (1) any decision by machine being automatic; (2) all automatic steps must be performed based on some prior configuration; and (3) that the routing of packets automatically by a gateway would corresponding to "automatic" in the context of amended Claim 1. In view of the above discussion with regard to the claimed "first connection", and "second connection", it is respectfully submitted that the language of "automatically establishing a second connection to the detected network" has the particular meaning of first requiring the first connection to be made successfully so as to enable a second connection to be established automatically without user intervention.

Applicants identified that the selection of a particular hotspot service in urban areas can be plentiful and causes confusion for a user to decide whether to manually switch the network connection or even remember which profile is associated with the different network

connections (see, e.g., pages 1 and 2). Applicants solution addresses issues such as a user walking on a street where hotspots are ubiquitous, by providing a terminal that may frequently detect hotspots and then provide an automatic connection to a hotspot with a predetermined profiles (page 54, second full paragraph, for example).

In this context, it is respectfully submitted that Blewett does not in fact disclose automatically establishing a second connection to the detected network based on the managed profile if the determination means determines that the managing profile manages the managed profile corresponding to the detected network. This feature is simply absent in Blewett, and the broad construction of the term “automatic” in the Office Action does not comport with the full claim language of “automatically establishing a second connection...”, as claimed. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Blewett does not disclose the claimed first connection, second connection or automatically establishing a second connection features of amended Claim 1.

Although of differing statutory class and/or scope it is respectfully submitted that Claims 3, 5-6 and 8-9 also patentably define over Blewett. Neither Ogle, nor Beck, Winkler, or Koyanagi disclose the features that are also absent in amended Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that no matter how any of these secondary references are combined with Blewett, the combination does not teach or suggest all of the elements of the rejected dependent claims.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-11, as amended, is patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

I:\ATTY\BDL\24s\242220US\242220US-AM2.DOC